

## **Required Supplementary Information**

## Budgetary Information

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule

#### General Fund

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2002  
(expressed in thousands)

	General Fund			
	Original Budget 2001-03 Biennium	Final Budget 2001-03 Biennium	Actual 2001-03 Biennium	Variance with Final Budget
Budgetary fund balance, July 1	\$ 410,520	\$ 564,950	\$ 564,950	\$ -
<b>Resources:</b>				
Taxes	21,535,714	20,739,562	10,319,064	(10,420,498)
Licenses, permits, and fees	161,284	155,358	75,478	(79,880)
Other contracts and grants	480,967	452,498	217,352	(235,146)
Timber sales	7,255	7,352	3,646	(3,706)
Federal grants-in-aid	9,725,433	9,935,955	4,716,193	(5,219,762)
Charges for services	69,918	72,404	35,060	(37,344)
Interest income	91,500	92,507	30,894	(61,613)
Miscellaneous revenue	97,261	100,910	37,406	(63,504)
Transfers from other funds	351,964	1,198,178	675,759	(522,419)
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>32,931,816</b>	<b>33,319,674</b>	<b>16,675,802</b>	<b>(16,643,872)</b>
<b>Charges to appropriations:</b>				
General government	2,367,753	2,266,485	1,155,664	1,110,821
Human services	16,292,131	16,186,918	7,932,359	8,254,559
Natural resources and recreation	509,265	480,021	243,740	236,281
Transportation	47,217	46,574	30,036	16,538
Education	13,863,237	13,757,902	6,789,096	6,968,806
<b>Capital outlays</b>	<b>294,045</b>	<b>235,269</b>	<b>34,803</b>	<b>200,466</b>
<b>Transfers to other funds</b>	<b>140,142</b>	<b>140,650</b>	<b>99,803</b>	<b>40,847</b>
<b>Total Charges to appropriations</b>	<b>33,513,790</b>	<b>33,113,819</b>	<b>16,285,501</b>	<b>16,828,318</b>
<b>Excess available for appropriation</b>				
<b>Over (Under) charges to appropriations</b>	<b>(581,974)</b>	<b>205,855</b>	<b>390,301</b>	<b>184,446</b>
<b>Reconciling Items:</b>				
Changes in reserves (net)	-	-	16,332	16,332
Entity adjustments (net)	-	-	30,622	30,622
Accounting and reporting changes (net)	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Reconciling Items</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>46,954</b>	<b>46,954</b>
<b>Budgetary Fund Balance, June 30</b>	<b>\$ (581,974)</b>	<b>\$ 205,855</b>	<b>\$ 437,255</b>	<b>\$ 231,400</b>

**Budgetary Information**  
**Budgetary Comparison Schedule**  
**Budget to GAAP Reconciliation**  
**General Fund**

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2002  
(expressed in thousands)

	General Fund
<b>Sources/inflows of resources</b>	
Actual amounts (budgetary basis) "Available for Appropriation" from the Budgetary Comparison Schedule	\$ 16,675,802
Differences - budget to GAAP:	
The following items are inflows of budgetary resources but are not revenue for financial reporting purposes:	
Transfers from other funds	(675,759)
Budgetary fund balance at the beginning of the year	(564,950)
The following items are not inflows of budgetary resources but are revenue for financial reporting purposes:	
Noncash commodities and food stamps	347,840
Unanticipated receipts	69,271
Noncash revenues	30,622
Revenues collected for other governments	23,159
<b>Total revenues as reported on the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance - Governmental Funds</b>	<b>\$ 15,905,985</b>

<b>Uses/outflows of resources</b>	
Actual amounts (budgetary basis) "Total Charges to Appropriations" from the Budgetary Comparison Schedule.	\$ 16,285,501
Differences - budget to GAAP:	
Budgeted expenditure transfers are recorded as expenditures in the budget statement but are recorded as other financing source (use) for financial reporting purposes.	(640,520)
Transfers to other funds are outflows of budgetary resources but are not expenditures for financial reporting purposes.	(99,803)
The following items are not outflows of budgetary resources but are recorded as current expenditures for financial reporting purposes.	
Noncash commodities and food stamps	347,840
Expenditures related to unanticipated receipts	69,271
Capital lease acquisitions	7,039
Distributions to other governments	23,159
<b>Total expenditures as reported on the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance - Governmental Funds</b>	<b>\$ 15,992,487</b>

## Budgetary Information

### Notes to Required Supplementary Information

#### General Budgetary Policies and Procedures

The Governor is required to submit a budget to the state Legislature no later than December 20 of the year preceding odd-numbered year sessions of the Legislature. The budget is a proposal for expenditures in the ensuing biennial period based upon anticipated revenues from the sources and rates existing by law at the time of submission of the budget. The Governor may additionally submit, as an appendix to the budget, a proposal for expenditures in the ensuing biennium from revenue sources derived from proposed changes in existing statutes.

The appropriated budget and any necessary supplemental budgets are legally required to be adopted through the passage of appropriation bills by the Legislature and approved by the Governor. Operating appropriations are generally made at the fund/account and agency level; however, in a few cases, appropriations are made at the fund/account and agency/program level. Operating appropriations cover either the entire biennium or a single fiscal year within the biennium. Capital appropriations are biennial and are generally made at the fund/account, agency, and project level.

Legislative appropriations are strict legal limits on expenditures/expenses, and overexpenditures are prohibited. All appropriated and certain nonappropriated funds are further controlled by the executive branch through the allotment process. This process allocates the expenditure/expense plan into monthly allotments by program, source of funds, and object of expenditure. According to statute RCW 43.88.110(2), except under limited circumstances, the original allotments are approved by the Governor and may be revised only at the beginning of the second year of the biennium and must be initiated by the Governor. Because allotments are not the strict legal limit on expenditures/expenses, the budgetary schedules presented as required supplementary information (RSI) are shown on an appropriation versus actual comparison rather than an allotment versus actual comparison.

Proprietary funds earn revenues and incur expenses (i.e., depreciation or budgeted asset purchases) not covered by the allotment process. Budget estimates are generally made outside the allotment process according to prepared business plans. These proprietary fund business plan estimates are adjusted only at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Additional fiscal control is exercised through various means. OFM is authorized to make expenditure/expense allotments based on availability of unanticipated receipts, mainly federal government grant increases made during a fiscal year. State law does not preclude the over expenditure of allotments, although RCW 43.88.110(3) requires that the Legislature be provided an explanation of major variances.

Operating encumbrances lapse at the end of the applicable appropriation. Capital outlay encumbrances lapse at the end of the biennium unless reappropriated by the Legislature in the ensuing biennium. Encumbrances outstanding against continuing appropriations at fiscal year end are reported as reservations of fund balance.

#### Budgetary Reporting versus GAAP Reporting

Governmental funds are budgeted materially in conformance with GAAP. However, the presentation in the accompanying budgetary schedules is different in certain respects from the corresponding Statements of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance (governmental operating statement). In the accompanying budgetary schedules, budget and actual expenditures are reported only for appropriated activities. Expenditures are classified based on whether the appropriation is from the operating or capital budget. Expenditures funded by operating budget appropriations are reported as current expenditures classified by the function of the agency receiving the appropriation. Expenditures funded by capital budget appropriations are reported as capital outlays.

However, in the governmental operating statements, all governmental funds are included and expenditures are classified according to what was actually purchased. Capital outlays are fixed asset acquisitions such as land, buildings, and equipment. Debt service expenditures are principal and interest payments. Current expenditures are all other governmental fund expenditures classified based on the function of the agency making the expenditures.

Additionally, certain activities are excluded from the budgetary schedules because they are not appropriated. These activities include: activities designated as nonappropriated by the Legislature, such as the Higher Education Special Revenue Fund, Higher Education Endowment Fund, Unemployment Compensation Fund, Institutional Fund, Higher Education Student Services Fund, Printing Services Fund, Higher Education Revolving Fund, Risk Management Fund, federal surplus food commodities, electronic food stamp benefits, capital leases, note proceeds, and resources collected and distributed to other governments. Further,

certain expenditures are appropriated as operating transfers.

These transfers are reported as operating transfers on the budgetary schedules and as expenditures on the governmental operating statements. The factors contributing to the differences between the Budgetary Comparison Schedule and the Statement of Revenues,

Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance are noted in the previous Budget to GAAP reconciliation.

Budgetary Fund Balance consists of unreserved, undesignated fund balance; unreserved fund balance, designated for other specific purposes; and reservation for encumbrances on the Balance Sheet.

## Pension Plan Information

### Public Employees' Retirement System - Plan 1

#### Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	9/30/2001	12/31/2000	12/31/1999	12/31/1998	12/31/1997	12/31/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 10,990	\$ 11,111	\$ 10,456	\$ 9,219	\$ 8,211	\$ 7,197
Actuarial Accrued Liability	12,088	11,695	11,636	11,227	10,817	10,339
Unfunded Actuarial Liability	1,098	584	1,180	2,008	2,606	3,142
Percentage Funded	91%	95%	90%	82%	76%	70%
Covered Payroll	1,085	1,132	1,184	1,233	1,271	1,308
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a Percentage of Covered Payroll	101%	52%	100%	163%	205%	240%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Teachers' Retirement System - Plan 1

### Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	9/30/2001	6/30/2000	6/30/1999	6/30/1998	6/30/1997	6/30/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 9,342	\$ 9,372	\$ 8,696	\$ 7,819	\$ 6,844	\$ 5,924
Actuarial Accrued Liability	9,895	9,566	9,529	9,354	9,044	8,796
Unfunded Actuarial Liability	553	194	833	1,535	2,200	2,872
Percentage Funded	94%	98%	91%	84%	76%	67%
Covered Payroll	800	957	984	1,046	1,083	1,128
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a Percentage of Covered Payroll	69%	20%	85%	147%	203%	255%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Pension Plan Information

### Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System- Plan 1 Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	9/30/2001	12/31/2000	12/31/1999	12/31/1998	12/31/1997	12/31/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 5,369	\$ 5,440	\$ 5,150	\$ 4,568	\$ 4,087	\$ 3,594
Actuarial Accrued Liability	4,153	4,002	4,125	3,906	3,767	4,006
Unfunded (Assets in Excess of)						
Actuarial Liability	(1,216)	(1,437)	(1,024)	(662)	(320)	412
Percentage Funded	129%	136%	125%	117%	108%	90%
Covered Payroll	87	95	106	117	128	137
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a						
Percentage of Covered Payroll	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	301%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Judicial Retirement System

### Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	9/30/2001	12/31/2000	12/31/1999	12/31/1998	12/31/1997	12/31/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 9	\$ 8	\$ 5	\$ 4
Actuarial Accrued Liability	91	93	94	97	95	92
Unfunded Actuarial Liability	81	83	85	89	90	88
Percentage Funded	11%	11%	10%	8%	5%	4%
Covered Payroll	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a						
Percentage of Covered Payroll	2700%	2075%	2125%	2225%	2250%	1760%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Pension Plan Information

### Volunteer Fire Fighters' Relief and Pension Fund

#### Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	12/31/2001	12/31/2000	12/31/1999	12/31/1998	12/31/1997	12/31/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 129	\$ 126	\$ 118	\$ 102	\$ 91	\$ 74
Actuarial Accrued Liability	99	96	98	94	69	67
Unfunded (Assets in Excess of)						
Actuarial Liability	(30)	(30)	(20)	(8)	(22)	(7)
Percentage Funded	130%	131%	120%	109%	132%	110%
Covered Payroll*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a						
Percentage of Covered Payroll	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\*Covered Payroll is not presented because it is not applicable since this is a volunteer organization.

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Judges' Retirement Fund

### Schedule of Funding Progress

Valuation Years 2001 through 1996 (dollars in millions)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Actuarial Valuation Date	9/30/2001	12/31/2000	12/31/1999	12/31/1998	12/31/1997	12/31/1996
Actuarial Value of Plan Assets	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 3
Actuarial Accrued Liability	6	6	6	7	7	7
Unfunded Actuarial Liability	1	1	2	3	3	4
Percentage Funded	83%	83%	67%	57%	57%	43%
Covered Payroll	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4
Unfunded Actuarial Liability as a						
Percentage of Covered Payroll	1000%	1000%	2000%	3000%	1500%	1000%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary



## Pension Plan Information

### Schedules of Contributions from Employers and Other Contributing Entities

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2002 through 1997

	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997
<b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>						
<b>System - Plan 1</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required						
Contribution	\$ 164.3	\$ 118.8	\$ 199.2	\$ 237.6	\$ 287.2	\$ 355.0
Employers' Actual Contribution	68.6	181.7	200.2	234.3	226.1	206.0
Percentage Contributed	42%	153%	101%	99%	79%	58%
<b>Public Employees' Retirement</b>						
<b>System - Plan 2/3</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required						
Contribution	\$ 72.0	\$ 55.6	\$ 103.6	\$ 86.6	\$ 106.3	\$ 185.0
Employers' Actual Contribution	51.0	115.0	101.9	238.4	222.8	224.0
Percentage Contributed	71%	207%	98%	275%	210%	121%
<b>Teachers' Retirement</b>						
<b>System - Plan 1</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required						
Contribution	\$ 119.8	\$ 90.6	\$ 176.1	\$ 209.7	\$ 269.7	\$ 338.0
Employers' Actual Contribution	59.5	141.3	183.0	222.5	211.6	210.0
Percentage Contributed	50%	156%	104%	106%	78%	62%
<b>Teachers' Retirement</b>						
<b>System - Plan 2/3</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required						
Contribution	\$ 66.7	\$ 40.4	\$ 56.2	\$ 45.9	\$ 59.8	\$ 82.0
Employers' Actual Contribution	46.4	69.6	75.3	100.2	105.6	103.0
Percentage Contributed	70%	172%	134%	218%	177%	126%
<b>School Employees' Retirement</b>						
<b>System - Plan 2/3</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required						
Contribution	\$ 19.5	\$ 6.7	**	**	**	**
Employers' Actual Contribution	11.3	19.9	**	**	**	**
Percentage Contributed	58%	297%	**	**	**	**

\*\* SERS did not exist prior to 9/1/2000

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Pension Plan Information

### Schedules of Contributions from Employers and Other Contributing Entities

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2002 through 1997

	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997
<b>Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System - Plan 1</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.3	\$ 6.9	\$ 7.5	\$ 8.1
Employers' Actual Contribution	0.1	0.1	6.3	7.2	7.6	8.2
Percentage Contributed	NA	NA	100%	104%	101%	101%
State Annual Required Contribution	-	-	-	-	-	67.1
State Actual Contribution	-	-	-	48.8	50.4	66.7
Percentage Contributed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	99%

<b>Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System - Plan 2</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ 26.2	\$ 20.3	\$ 26.9	\$ 22.3	\$ 22.5	\$ 28.1
Employers' Actual Contribution	24.0	31.5	26.2	34.3	31.1	28.5
Percentage Contributed	92%	155%	97%	154%	138%	101%
State Annual Required Contribution	17.5	13.5	18.0	14.9	15.0	18.7
State Actual Contribution	15.6	20.9	17.1	22.2	20.1	17.7
Percentage Contributed	89%	155%	95%	149%	134%	95%

<b>Washington State Patrol Retirement System</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.5
Employers' Actual Contribution	-	-	-	5.9	6.0	6.8
Percentage Contributed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1360%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Pension Plan Information

### Schedules of Contributions from Employers and Other Contributing Entities

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2002 through 1997

	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997
<b>Judicial Retirement System</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ 14.2	\$ 13.3	\$ 12.5	\$ 12.2	\$ 11.6	\$ 12.7
Employers' Actual Contribution	6.2	7.3	7.3	8.8	8.8	6.9
Percentage Contributed	44%	55%	58%	72%	76%	54%
<b>Judges' Retirement Fund</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ 0.2	\$ 0.2	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.4	\$ 0.4
Employers' Actual Contribution	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Percentage Contributed	150%	400%	267%	267%	200%	200%
<b>Volunteer Fire Fighters' Relief and Pension Fund</b> (expressed in millions)						
Employers' Annual Required Contribution	\$ 0.8	\$ 0.7	\$ 0.7	\$ 0.8	\$ 0.7	\$ 0.5
Employers' Actual Contribution	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.6
Percentage Contributed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	120%
State Annual Required Contribution	-	-	0.1	0.8	-	0.4
State Actual Contribution	3.3	3.3	2.7	2.5	2.0	3.0
Percentage Contributed	N/A	N/A	2700%	313%	N/A	750%

Source: Washington State Office of the State Actuary

## Pension Plan Information

### Notes to the Required Supplementary Information

### Defined Benefit Pension Plans

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2002

The information presented in the required supplementary schedules was determined as part of the actuarial valuations at the dates indicated below. Additional information as of the latest valuation follows.

	PERS Plan 1	PERS Plan 2/3	TRS Plan 1	TRS Plan 2/3	SERS Plan 2/3
Valuation - date	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001
Actuarial cost method	entry age	aggregate**	entry age	aggregate**	aggregate**
Amortization Method					
Funding	level %	n/a	level %	n/a	n/a
GASB	level \$	n/a	level \$	n/a	n/a
Remaining amortization period (closed)	6/30/2024	n/a	6/30/2024	n/a	n/a
Asset valuation method	4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value
Actuarial assumptions:					
Investment rate of return	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Projected salary increases					
Salary Inflation at 4.5%, plus the merit increases described below:					
initial salary merit (grades down to 0%)	6.1%	6.1%	6.2%	6.2%	7.0%
merit period (years of service)	17 yrs	17 yrs	17 yrs	17 yrs	17 yrs
Includes inflation at	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%
Cost of living adjustments	Uniform COLA* Gainsharing COLA*	CPI increase, maximum 3%	Uniform COLA* Gainsharing COLA*	CPI increase, maximum 3%	CPI increase, maximum 3%

\* Generally, all retirees over age 66 receive an increase in their monthly benefit at least once a year.

The Uniform COLA increase is added every July. On 7/1/1999, it was \$0.77 per year of service.

The Gainsharing COLA is added every even-numbered year if certain extraordinary investment gains are achieved.

For 2000, the gain sharing COLA was \$0.28 per year of service. On 1/1/2002, no Gainsharing COLA was added.

The Uniform COLA amount is calculated as the last Uniform COLA amount plus any Gainsharing COLA amount,

all increased by 3%. On 7/1/2000, it was  $(\$0.77 + \$0.28) \times 1.03 = \$1.08$ . On 7/1/2001, it was  $(\$1.08 + \$0.00) \times 1.03 = \$1.11$ .

On 7/1/2002, it was  $(\$1.11 + \$0.00) \times 1.03 = \$1.14$ .

\*\* The aggregate cost method does not identify or separately amortize unfunded actuarial liabilities.

\*\*\* pay-as-you-go basis funding

LEOFF Plan 1	LEOFF Plan 2	WSPRS	JRS	Judges	VFFRPF
9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	9/30/2001	12/31/2001
entry age	aggregate**	aggregate**	entry age***	entry age***	entry age
level %	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	level \$
level \$	n/a	n/a	level \$	level \$	level \$
6/30/2024	n/a	n/a	12/31/2008	12/31/2008	12/31/2017
4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value	4-year smoothed fair value	market	market	4-year smoothed fair value
8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00% n/a
11.7% 21 yrs	11.7% 21 yrs	6.0% 20 yrs	0.0%	0.0%	n/a none
3.50% CPI increase	3.50% CPI increase, maximum 3%	3.50% CPI increase, maximum 3%	3.50% 3.00%	3.50% none	

## Information about Infrastructure Assets Reported Using the Modified Approach

### Condition Assessment

#### Pavement Condition

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) owns and maintains 19,164 lane miles of highway, including ramps and collectors. WSDOT has been rating pavement condition since 1969. Pavement rated in *good* condition is smooth and has few defects. Pavement in *poor* condition is characterized by cracking, patching, roughness and rutting. Pavement condition is rated using three factors: Pavement Structural Condition

(PSC), International Roughness Index (IRI), and Rutting. In 1993 the Legislature required WSDOT to rehabilitate pavements at the Lowest Life Cycle Cost, which has been determined to occur at a PSC range between 40 and 60, or when triggers for roughness or rutting are met. The trend over the last five years has shown slight decreases in the percent of pavements in poor or worse condition.

WSDOT uses the following scale for Pavement Structural Condition (PSC):

Category	PSC Range	Description
Very Good	80 – 100	Little or no distress. Example: Flexible pavement with 5% of wheel track length having “hairline” severity alligator cracking will have a PSC of 80.
Good	60 - 80	Early stage deterioration. Example: Flexible pavement with 15% of wheel track length having “hairline” alligator cracking will have a PSC of 70.
Fair	40 - 60	This is the threshold value for rehabilitation. Example: Flexible pavement with 25% of wheel track length having “hairline” alligator cracking will have a PSC of 50.
Poor	20 - 40	Structural deterioration. Example: Flexible pavement with 25% of wheel track length having “medium (spalled)” severity alligator cracking will have a PSC of 30.
Very Poor	0 - 20	Advanced structural deterioration. Example: Flexible pavement with 40% of wheel track length having “medium (spalled)” severity alligator cracking will have a PSC of 10. May require extensive repair and thicker overlays.

The PSC is a measure based on distresses such as cracking and patching which are related to the pavement’s ability to carry loads. Pavements develop structural deficiencies due to truck traffic and cold weather. WSDOT attempts to program rehabilitation for pavement segments when they are projected to reach a PSC of 50. A PSC of 50 can occur due to various amounts and severity of distress. See above table for examples for flexible pavements such as asphalt. For rigid pavements (such as Portland cement concrete), a PSC of 50 represents 50 percent of the concrete slabs exhibiting joint faulting with a severity of 1/8 to ¼ inch (faulting is the elevation difference at slab joints and results in a rough ride – particularly in large trucks). Further, a PSC of 50 can also be obtained if 25 percent of concrete slabs exhibit two to three cracks per panel.

The International Roughness Index (IRI) uses a scale in inches per mile. Rutting is measured in millimeters. The three indices (PSC, IRI, and Rutting) are combined to rate a section of pavement which is assigned the lowest category of any of the three ratings. The following table

shows the combined explanatory categories and the ratings for each index.

Category	PSC	IRI	Rut
Very Good	100 – 80	≤ 95	≤ 4
Good	80 – 60	95 – 170	4 – 8
Fair	60 – 40	170 – 220	8 – 12
Poor	40 – 20	220 – 320	12 – 16
Very Poor	0 – 20	> 320	> 16

**Notes:** Based on WSPMS 2002 database. Ramps are not included. Based on all three indices: PSC, IRI and Rut. A section of pavement is assigned the lowest category based on the three indices. The following table lists the explanatory categories and the ranges of the underlying indices. From 1991 - 1998, previous year IRI and rut values were used for those sections that were not surveyed in a particular year.

Beginning in 1999, the pavement distress survey procedure changed from a visual survey to an automated survey. In the automated survey, high-resolution video images are collected at highway speed and these video images are then rated on special workstations at 3-6 mph speed. This change has also resulted in a more detailed classification and recording of various distresses that are rated.

Pavement condition surveys are generally conducted in the fall of each year, then analyzed during the winter and spring, with the previous year's results available by July each year. The chart below shows recent pavement condition ratings for the State Highway System, using the combination of the three indices described above.

### Condition Rating of Washington State Department of Transportation's Pavement

	Percentage of Pavement in Fair or Better Condition				
	<u>2001*</u>	<u>2000*</u>	<u>1999*</u>	<u>1998*</u>	<u>1997*</u>
Statewide - Chip Seals	89	92	91	76	76
Statewide - Asphalt	92	95	93	90	89
Statewide - Concrete	92	92	90	92	92
Statewide - All Pavements (based on total lane miles rated)	91	94	92	87	86

	Percentage of Pavement in Poor or Very Poor Condition				
	<u>2001*</u>	<u>2000*</u>	<u>1999*</u>	<u>1998*</u>	<u>1997*</u>
Statewide - Chip Seals	11	8	9	24	24
Statewide - Asphalt	8	5	7	10	11
Statewide - Concrete	8	8	10	8	8
Statewide - All Pavements (based on total lane miles rated)	9	6	8	13	14

\* Calendar year data. Assessments are typically made in the fall of each year, and verified during the winter and spring, with final results released in June. Years indicated are when the physical assessment was done in the fall.

More information about pavement management at the Department of Transportation may be obtained at:  
[http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fossc/mats/pavement/pave\\_management\\_main.htm](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fossc/mats/pavement/pave_management_main.htm)

## Bridge Condition

There are 3,063 state-owned bridges with a total deck area of 45,261,272 square feet. All bridges are inspected on a two to four year interval, with no more than 10 percent of the bridges inspected less than every three years. Underwater bridge components are inspected by divers at least once every five years. Special emphasis is given to the ongoing inspection and maintenance of major bridges which represent a significant public investment due to size, complexity or strategic location. Information related to public bridges is maintained in the Washington State Bridge Inventory System (WSBIS). This system is used to develop preservation strategies and comprehensive recommendations for maintenance and construction, and for reporting to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

The following condition rating data is based on the structural sufficiency standards established in the FHWA "Recording and Coding Guide for the Structural Inventory and Appraisal of the Nation's Bridges." This structural rating relates to the evaluation of bridge superstructure, deck, substructure, structural adequacy and waterway adequacy. Three categories of condition were established in relation to the FHWA criteria as follows:

Category	National Bridge Inventory Code	Description
Good	6, 7, or 8	A range from no problems noted to some minor deterioration of structural elements.
Fair	5	All primary structural elements are sound but may have deficiencies such as minor section loss, deterioration, cracking, spalling or scour.
Poor	4 or less	Advanced deficiencies such as section loss, deterioration, cracking, spalling, scour or seriously affected primary structural components.

**Notes:** Bridges rated in poor condition may be restricted for the weight and type of traffic allowed.



## Condition Rating of Washington State Department of Transportation's Bridges

Percentage of Bridges in Fair or Better Condition					
	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1998</u>
Reinforced Concrete (1283 bridges in FY 2002)	97	96	95	na	na
Prestressed Concrete (1271 bridges in FY 2002)	99.5	99	99	na	na
Steel (344 bridges in FY 2002)	92	91	91	na	na
Timber (65 bridges in FY 2002)	70	71	71	na	na
Statewide - All Bridges (2963 bridges out of 3063 in FY 2002)	96.7	96	95	na	na

Percentage of Bridges in Poor Condition					
	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1998</u>
Reinforced Concrete (38 bridges in FY 2002)	3	4	5	na	na
Prestressed Concrete (6 bridges in FY 2002)	0.5	1	1	na	na
Steel (28 bridges in FY 2002)	8	9	9	na	na
Timber (28 bridges in FY 2002)	30	29	29	na	na
Statewide - All Bridges (100 bridges out of 3063 in FY 2002)	3.3	4	5	na	na

na - data not available

**Notes:** Bridges rated as poor may have structural deficiencies that restricted the weight and type of traffic allowed. WSDOT currently has 14 posted bridges and 152 restricted bridges. Posted bridges have signs posted which inform of legal weight limits. Restricted bridges are those where overweight permits will not be issued

for travel by overweight vehicles. Refer to <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fossc/maint/motor/> for more information. Any bridges determined to be unsafe are closed to traffic. WSDOT has no closed bridges at the present time.

Additional information regarding the Department of Transportation's bridge inspection program may be obtained at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/eesc/bridge/index.cfm> or  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/accountability/GrayNotebookDec-01.pdf>

## Emergency Air Field Condition

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), through its Aviation Division is authorized by RCW 47.68.100 to acquire and maintain airports. Under this authority, WSDOT owns eight emergency airfields and leases several others. Most of the airfields are located near or adjacent to state highways and range in character from paved to gravel or turf. The prime task of the airfields is to provide emergency facilities. Two airfields are in operational condition twelve months of

the year, with five operational from June to October each year. One is only available for emergency search and rescue use. Maintenance is done on each airfield annually to keep it at its existing condition of use. Each airfield is inspected a minimum of three times per year.

The definitions below form the rating criteria for the current airfield condition ratings which follow.

Category	Definition
General Use Community Airport	An airport with a paved runway capable of handling aircraft with a maximum gross certificated takeoff weight of 12,500 pounds.
Limited Use Community Airport	An airport with an unpaved runway capable of handling aircraft with a maximum gross certificated takeoff weight of 12,500 pounds.
General Recreational Use Airport	An airport with a turf (unpaved) runway near access to recreational opportunities with capacity for aircraft less than 12,500 pounds.
Limited Search and Rescue Forward Operating Location	An airport with a landing pad only capable of accommodating rotorcraft.

### Washington State Emergency Airfields

<u>Condition Rating</u>	<u>Number of Airports</u>					
<b>Owened airports:</b>						
Acceptable for general use as a community airport	2					
Acceptable for limited use as a community airport	1					
Acceptable for general recreation use	4					
Limited search and rescue forward operating location	1					
<b>Total owned airports</b>	<b>8</b>					
		<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1998</u>
Percentage of airports acceptable for general recreational use or better		88	88	88	88	na
Percentage of airports not acceptable for general recreational use or better		12	12	12	12	na
na - data not available						

na - data not available

**Notes:** One airport is open only as a limited search and rescue operating location and is expected to remain in that status.

For pictures of specific airfields, see our website at: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Aviation/airports/airport-default.htm>

## Information about Infrastructure Assets Reported Using the Modified Approach

### Comparison of Budgeted-to-Actual Preservation and Maintenance

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2002  
(expressed in thousands)

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Variance with Budget</u>
<b>Pavement:</b>			
Preservation	\$ 134,810	\$ 127,946	\$ 6,864
Maintenance	23,746	19,485	4,261
Total	<u>\$ 158,556</u>	<u>\$ 147,431</u>	<u>\$ 11,125</u>
<b>Bridges:</b>			
Preservation	\$ 24,270	\$ 16,307	\$ 7,963
Maintenance	11,430	11,012	418
Total	<u>\$ 35,700</u>	<u>\$ 27,319</u>	<u>\$ 8,381</u>
<b>Emergency air fields:</b>	\$ 70	\$ 28	\$ 42

**Notes:** Numbers for the Pavement and Bridges budget amounts came from the 2001-2003 biennial plan as shown in the WSDOT December 2001 *Monthly Financial Report* for sub-programs P1 (Roadway Preservation), P2 (Structures Preservation), and M2 (Roadway, Bridge & Tunnel maintenance). For FY 2002, the annual budget amount was calculated as half the biennial amount. The Preservation budgeted and actual amounts were adjusted for capitalized infrastructure and equipment in FY 2002.

The emergency airfields (program F3, State Airport Construction and Maintenance) budget amount came from the same sources as for pavements and bridges described above but is only one fourth of the biennial amount budgeted as half of the biennial budget is assigned for airfields not owned by WSDOT.

The Maintenance Accountability Process (MAP) measures and communicates the outcomes of 34 distinct highway maintenance activities. Maintenance results are measured via field condition surveys and reported as

Level of Service (LOS) ratings. LOS targets are defined in terms of the condition of various highway features ( i.e. percent of guardrail on the highway system that is damaged) and are set commensurate with the level of funding provided for the WSDOT highway maintenance program. More information about MAP may be obtained at:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fossc/maint/htm/accountability.htm>

The state implemented the requirements of Statement No. 34 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), including the provisions related to capitalizing and reporting infrastructure on the modified approach, in Fiscal Year 2002. While budget to actual information is not available for years prior to Fiscal Year 2002 using the GASB definitions of preservation and maintenance, historical budget to actual information for the entire Construction and Maintenance programs is available by contacting the WSDOT Budget Office at (360) 705-7500.

